DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 091 970 HE 005 526

AUTHOR	Nies, Judith
TITLE	Women and Fellowships.
INSTITUTION	Women's Equity Action League, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Apr 74
NOTE	27p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Women's Equity Action League Education and Legal Defense Fund, 795 National Press Building, Washington, D.C. 20004 ($1.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Finance; *Fellowships; *Females; *Higher Education; *Scholarships; Sex Discrimination; *Womens Education
IDENTIFIERS	Nieman Fellowship; *Rhodes Scholarship; White House Fellows

ABSTRACT

When women have been acknowledged to be doing original work in the sciences, sociology psychology; publishing many more books and articles than ever before; making their voices heard in professional associations, organizing art shows, giving voice and visibility to creative and new ideas in many fields--why do they remain outside the institutional reward system? Last year over 80% of the major fellowship awards went to men. There are many reasons that women are not found in higher numbers among fellowship applicants. One of the strongest is that the image of the fellowship recipient is male. Another difficulty is that information about many programs is informal, passing through word-of-mouth networks. Three recent developments are helping to change the situation: Title IX of the Higher Education Act; The Airlee House Conference which adopted a series of recommendations for opening up fellowship programs to greater participation by women; and the foundation that funds the fellowships. The succeeding sections concern 3 fellowships that have changed--Rhodes, Nieman, and White House Fellows; how to apply for fellowships; and how to choose the right fellowship. (Author/PG)

ED 091970

WOMEN AND FELLOWSHIPS

By

Judith Nies,
Director of the Project on Fellowships and
Foundations of the Women's Equity Action League

This is Report No. 1 of the Women's Equity Action League's Educational and Legal Defense Fund. The Fund's purpose is to assist in paying legal expenses in sex discrimination suits and to research, study and publish information on patterns of sex discrimination. Copies are available ($1.00 single copy) from WEAL Education and Legal Defense Fund, 795 National Press Building, Washington, D.C. 20004

April 1974

HE005526

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

I. INTRODUCTION: THE GUGGENHEIM FELLOWSHIP

In 1922 just at the beginning of a very promising career, a young man named John Guggenheim unexpectedly passed away. His bereaved parents were anxious to keep his memory alive and three years after his death Senator Simon Guggenheim and his wife Olga decided to begin a fellowship program for young people. Their wish was to "continue the influence of the young life of eager aspiration by establishing a foundation . . . in his name . . . ."

Thus the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation began in 1925. Its purpose was to "promote the advancement and diffusion of knowledge and understanding and the appreciation of beauty, by aiding without distinction on account of race, color or creed scholars, scientists and artists of either sex in the prosecution of their labors." (Italics added.)

Over the years the Guggenheim Foundation has dispensed over eight thousand fellowships in the sciences, social sciences, history and the arts. In 1972 over $4 million was given to 394 people (average grant was around $10,000), and the capital of the foundation had grown to over $115,000,000. What had become known as the Guggenheim Fellowship had little in common with the spirit of the truncated life of young John Guggenheim. It had become in fact one of the most prestigious institutional grants in accademia and in the arts.

Although age for applicants ranges between thirty and forty-five, most of the recipients--all well established in their professions--tend to be at the upper end of the age spectrum. Despite the specific language regarding sex, the Guggenheim Fellowship has remained largely for men. In 1971, for example, the foundation gave 312 grants. Seven went to women. (There are two series of Guggenheim grants, one for U.S. and Canadian citizens, another for citizens of the Western Hemisphere and the Philippines. Our figures are for U.S. grants). As the figures show (see the table on page 2), in the past five years women have never been more than eight percent of the recipients.

Why? When women have been acknowledged to be doing original work in the sciences, history, sociology, psychology; publishing many more books and articles than ever before, making their voices heard in professional associations, organizing art shows, giving voice and visibility to creative and new ideas in many fields--why do they remain outside the institutional reward system?

Year	Total Grants (U.S. and Canada only)	Women	Percentage of Total
1969	234	11	5
1970	253	10	4
1971	312	7	2
1972	321	26	8
1973	334	22	6

That question is at the center of this report.

Part of the answer is to be found in the letter from the President of the Guggenheim Foundation when we asked him the same question. "The Foundation," Gordon Ray explained, "has long experience in dealing with the efforts of one group or another to secure a favored position for its applicants. These efforts have always been resisted." He went on to state the Foundation's position:

> The Guggenheim Foundation makes its awards through annual national competitions solely on the basis of demonstrated accomplishment as judged by leading professionals in each field. We do this "without discrimination . . . on account of sex" in accordance with Senator Guggenheim's letter of gift. We do not endeavor to increase the participation of women, or of any other group among our applicants. As the number of highly qualified women applicants increases, however, more Guggenheim Fellowships will be awarded to them.

The hidden values in that statement can be summarized as follows: (1) There is no discrimination in the administration of the fellowships. Merit is triumphant. (2) Women are not recipients because they are not qualified applicants. (3) There is no need to undertake any special effort to evaluate selection procedures, selection boards, etc., to see if internal procedures work against the application of minority groups or women. (4) We are an impeccable, professional institution upholding the highest standards of professional attainment in many fields. Women do not meet these standards.

These are, by and large, the operative values of most prestigious fellowship programs. During the four years that the WEAL Project on Fellowships has been in operation,

many women--and men--have volunteered information about the inside workings of fellowship programs, have shared experiences about selection procedures, and have offered invaluable insight about the image of the "ideal fellow" that prevails in almost every program.

Our long run purpose in the project has been to monitor foundations and a range of grant-giving institutions to hopefully increase receptivity to women candidates. Our short-run purpose has been to give women a sense of the range of fellowship programs available, to describe application and selection procedures and to encourage women to learn the politics of the fellowship game.

We believe that it is a game women must learn to play. Up to now women have remained outside almost all the major fellowship programs, participating in such tiny numbers that a "aren't I lucky to be the exception" mentality is almost inevitable. (For the distribution of women in 64 fellowship programs see Appendix B of the Report on Women and Fellowship and Training Programs published by the American Association of Colleges, cited in Sources at the end of this report.)

The length of time that the WEAL Project has been in existence (1971-74) has greatly contributed to our ability to evaluate real changes in fellowship programs. Often it appears that a program in principle is opening up to women and minority candidates, but in fact the operative values of the program remain static. The values are oriented to management, scientific research, expansion of what has been called the "knowledge industry," career achievement. Often the practical effect of these values is to denegrate the contribution of women and minorities to society, deify degrees and institutional connections and develop a very low tolerance for creativity or criticism.

II. WHAT ARE FELLOWSHIPS AND WHY ARE THEY IMPORTANT?

Fellowships provide more than money. They provide recognition, give opportunities to gain specialized knowledge, develop confidence and leadership skills, open up new channels for professional contacts, increase awareness of developments in one's own field, and generally help cultivate that elusive quality known as "being a winner." They also provide financial support without which many good projects and much original writing would never be undertaken or

completed. A significant sector of the American economy revolves around grants and fellowship funding and at a time when economists are studying what is called the "grants economy" it is useful to conceive of fellowship support in much the same way one looks at a job. (Without fellowships much academic publishing, for example--a requirement for promotion and advancement--would never take place. It is uneconomic both for the writer and the publisher.) One fellowship administrator called fellowships "a bet on the future." Another described them as "middle management training programs in professions where people like to believe that merit alone is what sends people to the top."

Fellowships also serve a holdover function which operates beyond the actual year of the award. Fellowships in themselves become qualifications. An example of this process: A WEAL member, a lawyer with an excellent background, was turned down by a top Washington law firm for a job she had already been offered, because a man--who was also a Rhodes Scholar--had been taken in her place. The partner who informed her of this unfortunate situation was sincerely sorry, but as he put it, with all other things being equal the young Rhodes Scholar was "more qualified." As the section on the Rhodes Scholars program points out, women are prohibited from applying for the Rhodes program by the terms of Cecil Rhodes' will. Thus a pattern is established that is not easily broken. Women are not qualified to be Rhodes Scholars by virtue of their sex. Once they are in the job market competing with former Rhodes Scholars they are automatically "less qualified" because they are not a Rhodes.

At the top, as Robert Townsend says in Up the Organization, everyone is smart. What counts is the extras--channels to inaccessible people, political contacts, inside information, good understanding of institutional processes. This is true in business, government, accademia, the military, the legal profession and most other major institutions in American life. Fellowships provide some of those extras, and that alone makes them important.

III. ARE WOMEN OUTSIDE THE FELLOWSHIP NETWORKS?

Yes. Last year over 80% of major fellowship awards went to men. The Project on the Education and Status of Women of the American Association of Colleges issued the first statistical study of women as applicants and as recipients in over 64 fellowship programs. In the most prestigious programs 95% of the recipients were male. In scientific and

management fellowships women were around 2% of the recipients. (See NASA fellowships and Alfred P. Sloan Fellowships.) Many fellowship programs had never analyzed recipients by sex so were either unable or unwilling to provide data. (The Guggenheim Foundation was among these.)

There are many reasons that women are not found in higher numbers among fellowship applicants. One of the strongest is that the image of the fellowship recipient is male. The "scholar gentleman" is one of the strongest images operating in fellowship programs. Fellowship administrators blithely claim that if more women applied, more women would be accepted. However, human nature being what it is, women tend to apply where they think they can win. (The number of qualified applicants for the American Association of University Women Fellowships and the Eagleton Institute Awards testify to women's willingness to apply to programs where women win.)

The image of the Fellow as the scholar-gentleman seems to be rooted in Anglo-Saxon tradition (fellow is a word of Middle English origin meaning "one who accompanies") and is revealed in its purest form in the Rhodes Scholars program, which we examine in some detail later in the report. Rhodes' ideal of male leadership, scholarship and even athletic excellence seems to have permeated the fellowship world. The Moorhead Scholarships at the University of North Carolina, for example, are full-tuition grants for male students and are directly modeled on the Rhodes Scholarships.

Even the Smithsonian, a Federal agency which theoretically should know better, recently sent out a brochure for a projected center attached to their Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars which described this future incubator for scholars as "A place where men of letters and men of public affairs might . . . work together . . . live, dine, study and rub shoulders--and ideas--with each other." What could be more evocative of the all-male atmosphere of the men's colleges at Oxford where the fellows of the college have their own engraved silver napkin rings?

Promotional literature for many programs gives the impression that these are male enterprises. The word "he" is used consistently. Many qualified women quite rightly are unable to visualize themselves fitting the image portrayed. Therefore they simply do not apply.

Another difficulty is that information about many programs is informal, passing through word-of-mouth networks. Since past recipients tend to be men, they pass the word on to students or colleagues whom they feel have the best

chance of winning. In interviews with past fellowship winners (male) they have admitted that they would tell women to apply, but they really don't think that women have much of a chance of winning, so they don't encourage them.

Three recent developments are helping to change that situation.

1. Effective in July of 1972 Title IX of the Higher Education Act (Education Amendments Act of 1972) provided that

> No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

In application this means that no college or university which receives any form of federal financial assistance may discriminate on the basis of sex in any of the fellowship programs, public or private, which it administers. This should have serious consequences for the universities throughout the nation which administer national programs such as the Rhodes Scholarships, Marshall Scholarships (another British all-male program) and colleges which have internal scholarships such as the male-only Moorhead Scholarships at the University of North Carolina.

2. Five months after Title IX went into effect a group of fellowship administrators* assembled at Airlee House in Virginia at a Conference sponsored by the American Association of Colleges, American Council on Education, and American Association of University Women, and adopted a series of recommendations for opening up fellowship programs to greater participation by women. The recommendations were then circulated to over five thousand college and university administrators and to over a thousand fellowship

---

*Among the organizations represented were the American Association of University Women, Ford Foundation, American Political Science Association, Commission on White House Fellows, National Science Foundation, Atomic Energy Commission, The Smithsonian, National Institutes of Health, Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, U.S. Office of Education, Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, National Endowment for the Humanities, American Council on Education, American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business, Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation.

administrators. (This was done under a grant from the Exxon Foundation.) The major recommendations are summarized as follows:

1) Redesign all informational or promotional literature to read "he and she" or "they" as designations for program participants. Consideration should be given to including positive statement such as "Women and minorities are encouraged to apply."

2) Generate publicity about the fellowship program in places where women are likely to learn about it, i.e., newsletters of women's organizations, women's caucuses of professional organizations, women's colleges, alumnae magazines and campus newspapers.

3) Provide for more flexible age requirements since low age limits have a disproportionate effect in excluding women. (Women's careers develop more slowly. Many women are just reaching professional prominence at thirty-five or forty, the cut off age for many fellowship programs.)

4) Develop an official policy within the foundation or administering institution to review selection procedures and policies for sex bias.

5) Increase the number of women on selection boards and throughout the selection process.

6) Analyze internal biases towards married women, women with children, divorced women, single women. If women are to be asked how they will care for their young children, male applicants should be asked the same question.

In talking with a number of fellowship administrators the assumptions about women seemed to be that if the woman applicant was married then their husbands could support them and they didn't need a fellowship; if they had children, they would be neglecting their family responsibilities; if they were divorced, they were probably unstable; and if they were single they would probably get married and quit professional work. In short, women candidates always had "problems" that male candidates did not have.

3. A third impetus for changing the way in which fellowships are administered has been the growing pressures on the institution that often funds them--the foundation.

In the past few years foundations have been subject to growing criticism for their timidity, their bureaucracy, their function as a tax dodge, their structural inabilities to reflect changing social needs. The Twentieth Century Fund, an institution within the foundation world, published an extremely critical study of the social views, policies, and operative procedures of foundations. The Foundation Center, a clearing house for many foundations, has taken considerable effort to publicize the idea that foundations do have a sense of public accountability. "Foundations . . . have legal and moral obligations to act explicitly and solely in the public interest. They are accountable to the public for their performance," explained a recent Foundation Center booklet. It is not a concept that seems to have trickled down to the foundations. (During public debate in Congress in 1969 concerning the role of foundations and the need for new reporting requirements, the President of the Guggenheim Foundation referred to "the darkest days of the Congress's scrutiny . . . .") In the area of sex discrimination foundations have not been forthcoming about either their own hiring and promotion practices or about sex discrimination within projects they fund. The National Organization for Women (NOW) submitted testimony to the House Ways and Means Committee in 1973 detailing sex discrimination within some of the largest foundations. NOW's position was that foundations were abusing a position of public trust, that of tax exemption, by helping to institutionalize the exclusion of women and minorities from advancement in American business, education, science and the universities through their own personnel policies and failure to require non-discrimination in projects funded. (An analysis of Ford Foundation grants, for example, showed that under 4% of the total budget went to anything remotely connected to improving the status of women in America. And Ford Vice-president Arthur Trottenburg wrote to the WEAL Project, that "the rights of women is not a concern of the foundation at this time. . . .")

IV. THE DYNAMICS OF CHANGE: THREE CASE STUDIES

A. The Nieman Fellowships in Journalism

In 1938 Agnes Wahl Nieman gave a bequest to then president of Harvard, James Conant, to begin a program which would promote and elevate the standards of journalism in the U.S. Her husband had been the publisher of the Milwaukee Journal and along with a number of other people she was not entirely sure that journalism schools were the way to create a better group of journalists. Conant used the money to begin a one-year academic program at Harvard

for established journalists. It was the first program in any field to give working professionals a year off to examine ideas and gain knowledge. Its first curator was Archibald MacLeish.

The program grew in popularity until it became a plum among journalists. The first woman was admitted in 1945, at the insistence of Arthur Schlesinger, Sr. Applications had been received from women journalists every year since the program began. When both the Harvard Medical School and the Littauer Fellowships in Public Administration admitted women, Arthur Schlesinger, Sr., a member of the Nieman Committee, went to President Conant insisting that women be admitted. In 1945 the Nieman Program took its first 2 women. It was not, however, the beginning of a tidal wave of recognition for women journalists. From 1945 to 1972 there were a total of 14 women recipients out of approximately 324 American Niemans. The program expanded thanks to a Ford Foundation Grant of $1.2 million to the Nieman Foundation matched by funds raised by a committee of publishers and newspaper leaders. (The Ford Foundation grant could have made inclusion of women in the Nieman Program a condition of the grant.) But the composition of the program remained largely static,--white male journalists, twelve American, six foreign, who often learned about the fellowship through editors who had also been Nieman Fellows. A woman reporter on the Milwaukee Journal in the 50's said that there were a number of excellent women reporters on the paper but the editors never suggested that one of them apply to be a Nieman Fellow. When the Nieman fellows returned from Harvard they were automatically given a promotion and better assignments, while the women reporters were left to be "less qualified" than the men.

As a profession, journalism tends to have strong machismo mystique (which has had a not insignificant effect on the reporting of the woman's movement), and the composition of the Nieman Fellows program did nothing to try to change it. From 1968 to 1973 there were two American women recipients out of a total of 60 Nieman Fellows.

Year	Total Recipients	Women
1968	12	0
1969	13	0
1970	12	1
1971	11	1
1972	12	0

Then in 1973 there was a dramatic change in the program. Suddenly over a third of the recipients were women. Out of the supposed wasteland of women journalists appeared

Shirley Christian, the UN correspondent for Associated Press; Ellen Goodman, feature writer for the Boston Globe; Whitney Gould, an environmental reporter for the Capitol Times of Madison, Wisconsin; and Patricia Koval, a general assignment reporter for the Chicago Sun-Times (and author of The Woman Alone).

The dramatic shift in the participation of women as Nieman Fellows directly coincided with the arrival of a new director. James Thompson, a member of the history faculty at Harvard, took over in 1972. The literature describing the program began to change. Instead of consistently referring to the Nieman Fellow as a "he" the terminology was changed to read "journalist" or "they." Instead of relying on the old boy network of journalists in order to attract applicants, notices for the program were sent to schools and women's caucuses where women were likely to learn about it and apply on their own. And for the first time in the program's history, he asked women to sit on the Nieman selection board. (Doris Kearns, a former White House Fellow, was on the panel for 1973 candidates; Eileen Shanahan of the New York Times and former Radcliffe President Mary Bunting will be on the selection board for the 1974 candidates.)

The WEAL Project had monitored the Nieman Program since 1971. The previous director had not answered any questions regarding the participation of women in the program, nor had he responded to a request for numbers of women applicants and recipients. The information gained by the Project came largely from a notice in the Women's Press Association bulletin asking for experiences of women and minority men in applying to the Nieman Program, and from newspaper and magazine articles about the program. The lesson of the Nieman Fellows program seems to be that there is a great deal that can be done by getting rid of a stale director and finding someone who is open to change and new ideas. ("One thing I won't do," said Thompson during an interview by the WEAL Project, "is change the name of the program to Nieperson.")

B. Rhodes Scholarships

The Rhodes Scholarship has been called by the New York Times and an interviewer on NBC's Today Show as "the most prestigious scholarship in America," which is an interesting commentary since the scholarship is British and prohibits women from applying. The factual base on which the aura of the Rhodes rests is two years of study at Oxford with a stipend of about $4,000 a year. Thirty-two Americans

and 40 students from countries of the Commonwealth and West Germany gather every year at Oxford to imbibe the essence of Cecil Rhodes' vision of "manly outdoor sports . . . and qualities of manhood truth, courage, devotion to duty . . . ."

Cecil Rhodes spent most of his life in South Africa and made a fortune in mining, much of it diamond mines (De Beers). He died in 1902, six months after Queen Victoria, and left a good portion of his fortune (£ 3,000,000) to establish the Rhodes Scholarships. In the words of one of his personal secretaries he conceived of the scholarships as a way of "bringing the colonies closer to the mother country." The British liked the idea so much that his will was enacted as an Act of Parliament. It has been treated ever since, both by the Rhodes Trust in Britain and in America, as though the qualifications to be a Rhodes Scholar had been carried down from the Mount carved on the back side of the Tablet. The reality is that the Rhodes Trust has gone to Parliament several times in order to change the provisions of the will. (The most obvious amendments were the revoking of the German scholarships in 1916 and 1939. They were restored after the ending of hostilities.)

During his lifetime Rhodes wrote seven different wills. All his wills in one way or another expressed the urgency of his imperialist vision that his fortune be used for "the extension of British rule throughout the world." (Much has been made about the scope of Rhodes vision in making the scholarship open to both white and black races. However, one of Rhodes' most distinguished biographers feels that it is doubtful that Rhodes himself ever visualized blacks as participants in the program. Rhodes believed in "equal rights for every white man south of the Zambeizi" which he later amended to "every civilized man." In the view of 19th century Englishmen, civilization belonged to whites.) The first wills made male associates his heir. By the seventh will he had hit upon the idea of creating sors through a grandiose scholarship scheme. Rhodes never married and during his lifetime was considered something of a misogynist. His vision of the person who should carry his name was a male student of literary and scholastic attainment, a team athlete and one who showed the qualities of a gentleman. (The irony is that Rhodes himself could never have been a Rhodes Scholar. He was tubucular, had a weak heart, was nothing of a scholar, and never enjoyed athletics.)

In 1971 the WEAL Project wrote to the Rhodes Trust in America asking about actions to eliminate sex discrimination

from the Rhodes program* The response was not encouraging. The same year the University of Minnesota nominated a woman to be a Rhodes candidate. The Rhode. regional selection board refused to interview her, and her case was taken by the American Civil Liberties Union on the basis that a state university could not administer a fellowship program which clearly discriminated on the basis of sex, thus denying a student of due process and civil rights. The New York Times ran a front page story announcing that ye rs' Rhodes winners with the headline RHODES SCHOLARS NAMED: SCOPE OF AWARD WIDENED. The article neglected to mention that women were prohibited from applying. The "widened scope" referred to the fact that they had accepted a mountain climber instead of a "team" player. (John Oakes, the Times editorial page editor is a former Rhodes.)

In 1973 Harvard, which seems to be the main institutional link with Oxford, got into the picture and permitted Radcliffe to nominate three women candidates. With appropriate publicity Harvard announced the three women Rhodes candidates. According to Katherine Hutchins, Director of Fellowships who was quoted in the Radcliffe newspaper, "We plan to circulate a letter among all fifty state committees emphasizing that while we know that the males-only restriction exists, we wanted to inform them of our best candidates; it just happens some of them are women."

The letter was sent to all 50 chairmen of the State Rhodes Committees and another was sent to the officers of the American Trust by Harvard President Derek Bok and Radcliffe President, Matina Horner.

All this made for excellent public relations but had little to do with the real mechanics of opening the Rhodes Scholars program to women--namely a request to the warden of the Rhodes Trust in England to submit amending legislation to the British Parliament making the scholarships open to either sex.

---

*The Rhodes Fellowships for women are totally different awards both in origin and in intent. William Barber, the American Secretary of the Rhodes Trust, informed us that "The Rhodes Fellowships (for women) are not directly analogous to the Rhodes Scholarships, nor are they intended to be. . . . (They) are senior awards . . . are administered separately . . . decisions on the appointments . . . are made by the governing bodies of Oxford's colleges for women." (Taken from letter to WEAL Project, February 26, 1972.)

One troublesome aspect of this show of sex equality is that the President of Radcliffe's reputation has been made on her pioneering work in the field of success avoidance by women and women's supposed will to fail. Yet the way in which Harvard put forth RoAnn Costin, Emily Fisher and Dale Russakoff as candicates for the Rhodes Scholars program could only insure failure. It also furthered the myth that merit alone can triumph over institutional processes. The three women were not interviewed nor considered by the Rhodes selection committees.

The moral of the Rhodes story is that what looks like change may be good publicity and nothing more. It is a safe bet that a program that numbers as its alumni Carl Albert, Speaker of the House, Senator William Fulbright, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, John Bardemas, Chief Deputy to the Majority Whip in the House, Paul Sarbanes, Congressman from Maryland--is not without connections in the British Parliament nor without an understanding of legislative process. In 1973 a member of the LEAL Project (Linda Kamm, a lawyer with Capitol Hill experience) interviewed several M.P.'s in Britain and asked what it would take to change the sex provisions in the legislation setting up the Rhodes Trust. "A request from the Rhodes Trust," was the answer. "That's all. But they'll never make it. They think all this women's stuff is an American fad."

C. <u>The White House Fellows Program</u>

Every year it seems that at least half the returning Rhodes Scholars apply to the White House Fellows Program, the American counterpart of the Rhodes in terms of prestige and likelihood of access to positions of influence and power.

The program originated in 1964 under the Presidency of Lyndon Johnson. Designed by John Gardner the original concept of the program was to give young people (under thirty-five) with exceptional talent and proven accomplishment the opportunity to see how government works at the top. The stated purpose of the program is: "To provide gifted and highly motivated young Americans with some firsthand experience in the process of governing the nation and <u>a sense of personal involvement in the leadership of the society</u>." (Italics added)

Since there is a major problem in perceiving women as leaders, women have not been highly visible in the White House Fellows Program. The seventeen participants work

directly with a Cabinet Officer, have weekly briefings with other government officials and a three-week foreign trip in which they get exposure to the workings of American policies abroad. In 1970 when the WEAL Project first began monitoring the program there had been a total of 104 Fellows, 8 of whom had been women. (Except for the first year when there had been three women, the total of women had never been above 2 in any one year.)

Year	Total No. of Recipients	Women
1969	18	2
1970	17	1
1971	16	2
1972	17	1
1973	18	4

In 1970 the WEAL Project interviewed the Director of the White House Fellows Program and pointed out that the White House Fellows Program had never taken a married woman, although almost all of its male fellows had been married. The Director responded by saying that perhaps the best way to increase the participation of women in the programs was to set up a special program for the wives of the fellows. (However, in all fairness it must be pointed out that it was during his tenure that the program took its first married woman fellow.)

In 1971 the WEAL Project increased pressure for greater women's participation in a public program directly under presidential control. WEAL also protested the greatly increased presence of the military which had come to take three or four places each year. (Since women are not present in high level ranks in the armed forces those slots are effectively denied to female competition.) WEAL also protested the lack of women on the selection boards. That year the new Director responded by having the one minority woman fellow (also the first married woman fellow) write the inevitable letter which said (a) I have found no discrimination against women in the White House Fellows Program, (b) if we included more women we'd have to lower our standards, and (c) everything possible is being done to recruit more women. (That year one woman was chosen.)

In 1972 the WEAL Project ceased dealing directly with the White House Fellows Program and instead released information about the program to the press. (Jack Anderson wrote a column. A Washington Post reporter investigated bureaucratic unhappiness with the presence of the Fellows in top level positions. And a number of critical items

appeared pointing out that the program had become a place for career hustlers who instead of going back to where they came from to work in local public problems had instead stayed in Washington "consolidating contacts" or went into the private sector to use their Washington experience to make money.) At the same time the President was claiming that he would appoint more women to top posts if he could only find more "qualified" women. (Percentages of women in top jobs under Nixon are roughly the same as under Eisenhower.)

WEAL pointed out that the President controlled a program which provided such "qualifications" and which actively discriminated against women. We had documented studies of discriminatory questioning during personal interviews, the unchanged composition of selection panels and the extraordinarily chauvinistic remarks of some of the male fellows. (One White House Fellow assigned to the Interior Department had suggested in writing that the reason there were not more women in top policy jobs was that "you can't make a purse from a sow's ear overnight.")

In 1973 the program made an effort to attract more women applicants, sending notices to the professional women's caucuses and asking for nominations from prominent Republican women. In 1973 the highest number of women was selected since the beginning of the program, four out of eighteen.

The lesson of change from the White House Fellows Program seems to be that there is no substitute for bad publicity. Whether or not there is any ongoing institutional momentum for increasing the participation of women in the White House Fellows Program remains to be seen.

V. HOW DO YOU APPLY?

No matter what field you are in there is a fellowship, probably a series of fellowships, designed to allow you to broaden your base of experience. Fellowships are extra-educational devices that may count very heavily in evaluating a person's educational background. Women can get the formal degrees they need to be on a par with male colleagues. But they have a great deal of trouble in getting "the extras." Part of the difficulty is that women do not know about the great range of fellowship opportunities. Often professors or friends do not tell them about them since most of the winners tend to be male. In addition the range of skills required in applying for fellowships are extremely complicated.

A few tips from people who have been through the process of applying for fellowships and grants might be useful. No one should underestimate the amount of time it takes to fill out applications, write a project description, develop a narrative biography, rationalize expenditures into a budget, and agonize over recommendations. However, people who have done it have said that there are unexpected benefits in learning how to describe oneself professionally and that in many ways the fellowship process was the first step in learning how to take a long range look at career goals. It also helped in learning how to get grants from foundations or from government agencies.

In talking to men and women we found one important difference in the way the two sexes approach fellowship applications. Men do not take failure to receive the fellowship as personal rejection. Women do. Men tend to view fellowship applications as a professional chore or a big game. One man described the selection process as a huge lottery in which success depended on totally uncontrollable factors such as specific competition in a given year and composition of the selection panels. Women need to pick up some of that sense of gamesmanship.

Not all fellowships demand all of the following items but most have several of these elements:

1. Application forms. Be sure you understand exactly what information is being requested. If there is something on the form you don't understand, telephone and ask exactly what it means.

2. Recommendations. One of the most important parts of the application form. They are the people who can vouch for your work and for you. Choose your people carefully. If possible try to choose people who know something about the fellowship program or who have written recommendations for fellowships before.

However, a warning is in order. "Big names" carry weight and authority with selection panels. At the same time they are likely to be asked by a number of people for recommendations to the same program. Often an informal rating of applicants takes place. Hence, be sure that the "big name" is really interested in you and your work.

If the people whom you ask for recommendations do not know you or your work well, send them some extra documentary material--a narrative biography or reprints of articles, etc.

3. Project description. Emphasize how it builds on your previous experience, its continuity with your other work in the past. Focus on your unique capabilities to accomplish this particular project--concrete skills such as languages, experience with creative children, knowledge of Irish immigrants, etc. Try to give a sense of the significance of your work in relation to other work in the field. Be specific in the amount of work you plan to do within the time covered by the fellowship. Miracles are not expected. Try to get a preliminary critique of your project from an experienced person, preferably a former recipient.

4. Narrative biography. A narrative biography is supposed to give an integrated portrait of past experience. It should show a pattern of success, consciousness of goals and a progressive upward spiral of development as a personality and as a professional. The following hints on how to write one come from Richard Irish's book Go Hire Yourself an Employer (Doubleday 1973).

Make a list of personal achievements and job successes no matter how silly they may appear to you. Inventory all your education--special training courses, conferences, seminars, discussion groups. List all your jobs--part time, volunteer, vocational and full time. Then write it up as though you were writing your own obituary in the year 2000. A narrative biography is usually not more than 600 words or two pages long.

5. Budget. In applying for a grant or fellowship that is not for a specified amount of money, it is often necessary to submit a budget. In the same way we do not mind giving money to the starving victims of an earthquake or flood, but resent donating money to pay the salaries of the inflated staff of the United Givers Fund, fellowship programs do not like to give subsistence grants. They prefer to enable someone to visit Hittite sites in Turkey rather than to pay the rent.

Be specific. If the budget is for travel abroad call a travel agent for fares. Get authoritative per diem figures for subsistence at home or abroad. (The U.S. Government has standard tables revised on an annual basis.) Know the average size of the grant given by the program you are applying to.

General suggestions.--Try to learn something about the workings of the program and the mechanics of the selection process. Look at the biographies of recent recipients for

clues as to what type of background is emphasized and what level of achievement is expected. Try to talk with someone who has received one of the fellowships to get a feel for how the program operates. If there is a personal interview involved, definitely talk with someone who had been through the interview in order to find out what kinds of questions are asked and what qualities emphasized.

VI. IS THERE A FELLOWSHIP FOR YOU?

There are thousands of fellowships, in all fields, for many different purposes. There are so many in fact that a group in Chicago has started a computer service which--for a fee of $250--will match your accomplishments with the appropriate fellowship. There are, however, less expensive ways to research fellowship programs. Some of the major sources are listed in the bibliography. Many people approach the fellowship field with the narrow viewpoint of "what's available?" We think this is the wrong approach. Fellowships were usually created with the idea of providing a specific experience. Part of the trick in being a successful applicant is in conveying that you understand what that experience is. For example you have a B.A. and would like to do graduate work in a foreign country, learning a foreign language and spending time living abroad.

The Fulbright-Hays Graduate Study Program was set up by legislation which called for increasing "mutual understanding between peoples of the U.S. and other countries through the exchange of persons, knowledge and skills." It is administered by the Institute of International Education (809 United Nations Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10017) and gives grants for graduate level study in many countries in almost any field including the creative arts. At this level women do not do too badly.

Year	Total Recipients	Women
1968	723	290
1969	273	104
1970	286	103
1971	300	113

But if you have a Ph.D. and want to do study or research abroad and need a travel grant and a cost of living allowance you could try the Senior Fulbright Hays Advanced Research Grants. These are administered by the Committee on the International Exchange of Persons (2101 Constitution Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20418) and are grants for

scholars and specialists to conduct post-doctoral research abroad or to lecture in foreign institutions of higher education. Women do not do well in the advanced grants.

Year	Total Recipients	Women
1968	152	7
1969	56	3
1970	72	1
1971	112	6
1972	90	7

When the WEAL Project suggested that the poor showing of women receiving Senior Fulbright Hays Grants might be a result of the absence of women on the selection panels reading applications, the State Department responded by asking WEAL to come up with a list of names of qualified women to sit on the selection panels. It is a common response to ask the critical party to come up with the cure. (Money for the Fulbright grants is appropriated each year in the legislation for AID; AID then contracts out the administering of the programs.)

Suppose you are a graduate student in political science working for a Ph.D.; or a journalist who has worked for several years on a magazine, radio, or newspaper; or a lawyer who has taught for a year at a law school; or an employee of the Federal Government who is at least a GS-13. You would like some direct experience on Capitol Hill working for a Senator or a Congressperson learning how policy directives are translated into law.

Congressional Fellows gives a fellowship for a year's work on Capitol Hill. Administered by the American Political Science Association (1527 New Hampshire Ave., Washington, D.C. 20036), both federal government participants and outside political scientists, journalists and lawyers work six months for a Congressperson and six months for a Senator as Congressional Fellows. Women did not do at all well until 1972 when WEAL began asking a few Congresspeople to inquire about the absence of women from the Congressional Fellows program.

Political Scientists, Journalists, Law School

Year	Total Recipients	Women
1968-69	16	0
1969-70	17	0
1970-71	16	2
1971-72	16	1
1972-73	15	4
1973-74	14	3

Federal Participants

Year	Total Recipients	Women
1968-69	24	1
1969-70	25	4
1970-71	18	2
1971-72	28	7
1972-73	26	4
1973-74	32	6

You are in graduate school and you might be a college teacher or administrator and need financial help in order to finish graduate school. Danforth Fellowships offer a number of different programs in the area of higher education. They are administered by the Danforth Foundation (222 South Central Avenue, St. Louis, Missouri 63105). While women do not do well, they do much better in these fellowship programs than in many others. The following figures are for the Kent Fellowships which are intended for graduate students working towards a doctorate.

Year	Total Recipients	Women
1968	42	12
1969	34	10
1970	37	11
1971	40	12
1972	41	14

You are a scientist and have been doing mathematical research which is potentially of value to the space program. NASA (National Aeronautics and Space Administration) has a series of post-doctoral and resident resident research fellows for experimental and theoretical research projects in the physical, mathematical, life, space or engineering sciences which play a significant role in the space program.

For a number of reasons, one of them having to do with the way women are treated in professional positions at NASA (Ruth Bates Harris, a civil rights coordinator at NASA resigned in protest at the treatment accorded women and minorities) women do not do at all well in NASA fellowships. In fact they are barely visible.

Year	Total Recipients	Women
1968	111	3
1969	143	2
1970	117	3
1971	133	5

(If you would like to know more about NASA fellowships, write to the Office of Scientific Personnel, National Research Council, 2101 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20418.)

In what is a rather broad generalization, women tend to do very badly in fellowships in the physical sciences and in the fields leading to business management. Women hold 12% of the Ph.D.'s in economics, 6% in physics, 6% in management, yet they are almost invisible in the fellowship programs in these areas. Another example is the Alfred P. Sloan Research Fellowships. Named after Alfred P. Sloan (he also gave his name to the School of Management at MIT), the money was left for creative and imaginative projects in economics, mathematics, development of managerial leadership and increased equal opportunity in education. We are not entirely sure of what the "equal" means since women have been almost invisible as Alfred P. Sloan Fellows.

Year	Total Recipients	Women
1968	73	0
1969	73	0
1970	76	2
1971	77	0
1972	79	2

Sloan was President and Chief Executive Officer of General Motors. In 1934 he endowed the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation which among other efforts in promoting research in education, economics, business management and medicine (Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research) administers the Sloan Research Fellowships. (For further information write The Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, 630 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10020.)

CONCLUSION:

The WEAL Project on Fellowships began with the rather naive hope that we could learn about Fellowship programs, sensitize the directors regarding the participation of women, and in turn provide women with information about specific fellowship programs with some suggestions on "how to" apply.

--The White House Fellows program has increased the number of women by 300%. (In 1972 there was 1 woman out of 17 Fellows. In 1973 there were 4 women out of 18.)

--In one year the Nieman Fellows in Journalism doubled woman's participation of the past five years. In 1973 alone they awarded fellowships to four women journalists. (1968-72 of the 60 Niemans were awarded, two went to women. In 1973 4 out of 12 Niemans were women.)

--The Congressional Fellows Program made a 300% increase in the number of women participants in its program. From 1968 to 1971 the American Political Science Association gave 65 fellowships, 3 of which went to women. In 1972 alone they awarded 4 out of 15 of the fellowships to women. In 1973 they awarded 3 out of 14 awards to women. (There would have been 4 but one woman, Whitney Gould, chose to take the Nieman Fellowship rather than the Congressional Fellowship.)

--A few colleges and universities are questioning their policies regarding the unquestioned respect and unflinching adherence to the requirements of Cecil Rhodes.

In 1972 an American Rhodes Scholar publicly resigned from the Rhodes program calling it "racist and sexist." In his letter of resignation he observed, "The scholarship by its very nature . . . reinforces the view that in any 'civilized' society, a small elite will and should rule and that its dominance is based on a supposedly superior moral, cultural and intellectual cultivation. And of course the members of the [Rhodes] Trust fail even to consider that women might be potential leaders."

This in brief seems to be the problem for women in most fellowship programs. Only one purpose of the fellowship process is to identify people of merit and professional potential. The process of selection carries many more values about who should be a potential leader than most fellowship administrators are ever willing to admit.

Fellowships are part of the educational process. For too long they have been considered something apart, something extra. They deserve far more attention than they have received for the patterns of discrimination they develop and then enforce, and for the apolitical, technical and managerial values they transmit. When we asked one fellowship administrator if they had ever done a study (cost-effectiveness) of what actually happened to their fellows, where they went, what they did--if in fact, they fulfilled the goals of the program--he looked aghast. No one had ever questioned the fact that such a prestigious fellowship program could not be fulfilling its goals.

The greatest source of insight into fellowships came from many women and minority men who were able to analyze the meaning of their own experiences in the fellowship process and pass it on. They crystalized our real need to overcome (in Cynthia Ozick's phrase) the dubious habit of reverence.

GENERAL SOURCES

Annual Register of Grant Support, Academic Media, Orange, New Jersey. Available in most libraries. A comprehensive guide to grant support programs of government agencies, foundations and business and professional organizations. Describes program, conditions of eligibility, size of stipends, where to write to get applications and information.

The Foundation Directory, published yearly by the Russell Sage Foundation. Describes over 6,000 foundations in the United States with assets over $200,000. Available in libraries.

Directory of Fellowship Programs, issued by the American Association of University Women. A short pamphlet describing a number of different fellowship programs. Available from the AAUW, 2401 Virginia Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Fellowships from A to Z, by Jack Brewer. New York: Doubleday, 1968.

Women in Fellowship and Training Programs, issued by the project on the status and education of women, Association of American Colleges. The first statistical survey of number of women applicants, women recipients, total applicants, total recipients, percentage of women in fellowship programs. Also includes the recommendations of fellowship administrators adopted at Airlee House Conference, November, 1972. Available from American Association of Colleges, 1818 R Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009.

Go Hire Yourself an Employer, by Richard K. Irish. New York: Doubleday Anchor Book ($2.95). Has an excellent chapter on how to present your experience in either resume form or in narrative biography form.

Hearings on Taxes before Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives. March & April, 1973. Vol. 16, pp. 6424-6456. Testimony regarding sex discrimination by foundations. Fran Hosken testifying on behalf of the National Organization of Women.

"Sexism and the Russell Sage Foundation," report by Carol Brown of Brandeis University, August 12, 1971.

SOURCES ON SPECIFIC FELLOWSHIPS

For many fellowship programs there are no written sources. We relied on literature provided by the program itself, interviews with past fellows or candidates, and general information passed on by administrators or others who had contact with the programs.

This is particularly true for programs like the White House Fellows and the Congressional Fellows programs for which there is little public information about origins or history.

Guggenheim Fellowships: Directory of Guggenheim Fellows, 1925-1967, issued by the Guggenheim Foundation. Reports of the President and Treasurer, 1969 and 1970. Reports of the President and Treasurer, 1971 and 1972. Journal of the College Art Association, "Women in Art History Departments," by Ann Sutherland Harris, Ph.D.

Nieman Fellowships: Louis M. Lyons, "The Nieman Fellowships," Atlantic, Dec., 1964. Frank Hopkins, "How Nine Newspapermen spent a year at Harvard," Harper's, Feb., 1940. Jessie Sibert, "Man! Those fellows are gals," Editor and Publisher, Dec. 15, 1973. "Nieman Program Being Appraised," New York Times, Sept. 15, 1963. "Publishers to Aid Nieman Campaign," New York Times, Nov. 13, 1965. "Nieman Fellowships Open to Newspaper Women First Time," Washington Star, July 11, 1945. James B. Conant, My Several Lives, Memoirs of a Social Inventor. New York: Harper & Row, 1970, pp. 398-403. Louis B. Lyons, Reporting the News. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press, 1965, pp. 1-50.

Rhodes Scholars: The American Oxonian (The Official Magazine of the Association of American Rhodes Scholars), issues of July 1970; October 1970; January 1971; April 1971. Philip Jourdan, Cecil Rhodes, his private life by his private secretary. Gordon Le Suer, Cecil Rhodes, The man and his work by one of his private and confidential secretaries. New York, 1914. Sir Lewis Michell, The Life and Times of the Rt. Hon. Cecil John Rhodes, 1853-1902. New York, 1969. Sarah Millin, Rhodes (A critical biography by a South African woman and considered one of the best). London, 1952. Sir George Parkin, The Rhodes Scholarships. Boston, 1912. Basil Williams, Cecil Rhodes. New York, 1968. "U.S. Rhodes Scholar Quits Charging Racism, Sexism," Washington Post, May 3, 1973. "Breaking the Rhodes

Barrier," Parade Magazine, Dec. 3, 1972. "Harvard Would Let Women Seek Rhodes," Washington Post, Dec. 21, 1971. "Rhodes Scholars Named; Scope of Award Widened," New York Times, Dec. 18, 1971, p. 1. "Not for Men Only," MS Magazine, April 1973.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The WEAL Project on Fellowships and Foundations would like to extend its thanks and appreciation to the many people who assisted in compiling the information used in this report. Particular thanks go to Linda Kamm for her work on Rhodes Scholars; Carol Polowy for her work on the numerous Fulbright Scholarships; Judith Holmberg for her work on the White House Fellows; Arlene Horowitz for her research on women in higher education; Claire Sherman for her assistance on procedures and process in fellowship applications; Dr. Bernice Sandler of the Project on the Status of Women, American Association of Colleges, who sponsored the first conference of fellowship administrators; and Arvonne Fraser, President of the Women's Equity Action League who has supported and encouraged the Fellowship Project since its inception in 1971.